Course Description:

This course probes the development of an anthropology of the modern nation-state with an eye to what the nation-state is, has been, and is becoming. It considers the institutional, social and cultural forms that characterize and call into question the nation-state at the current historical juncture from a US-based as well as global vantage point.

A central objective is to develop the theoretical and methodological tools necessary for comprehending the state in a manner distinctively anthropological; that is, one giving paramount concern to systems of meaning and belief, personhood, agency, everyday practice, hidden and overt mechanics of power, and persistent structures and emergent forms. The course is equally concerned with discerning how an anthropological approach to the modern nation-state may draw upon yet differ from perspectives on the state developed within other disciplines--most significantly, political science, political geography and political sociology--and the new connections and divisions that may arise from staking out a common conceptual space.

The course builds its foundation upon two analytics. One is the historical development of the nation-state in Europe; the other is an older anthropology of the state centered on indigenous and non-western patterns of state formation. We investigate the emergence of a new orientation to the state carved out unknowingly, yet in tandem, by anthropological studies of nations and nationalism and a wider social scientific preoccupation with processes of globalization and the cataclysms of a post-cold war world. With these precedents in mind we look closely at those institutions considered definitive of the modern state: citizenship, bureaucracy, ideological apparaits, the pursuit of security, infrastructure, and a monopoly of violence. We also consider themes not conventionally aligned with state studies such as aesthetics, affect, nature, and the body. Insight is drawn from the theorizations of governmentality, bio-power, and
hegemony along with the possibilities offered by science studies, phenomenology, Marxism and critical theory.

Requirements:
1. Attendance (5%) Course attendance is required. Unexcused absence will result in final grade reduction.
2. Participation and Discussion Leadership (10%). Active and appropriate contribution to class discussion is expected of all students. In addition, each student will be a designated discussion leader for a selected class topic. The student will be responsible for raising questions, sharing quotes and wrapping-up class meeting recapping the central points and debates of the class meeting.
3. Quote Sheets (10%) To facilitate participation and class discussion, students should come to class ready to discuss 4 quotes extracted from the session’s reading. Please turn-in a 1 page ‘Quote Sheet’ (2% ea.) at the beginning of class or via email prior to class. Five quote sheets are required over the course of the semester. They must be submitted to the instructor but will not be graded.
4. Discussion Papers (50%) Over the course of the semester each student is required to write five 3-page Discussion Papers (10% ea). At least one of these papers will be presented to the class and provide the basis for leading a class discussion (see above). Please refer to the discussion questions in the syllabus. One discussion paper may address the relevance of the reading to one’s research interests. The last discussion paper will be a “taking-stock” essay critically assessing the major works and themes covered in class. SUBMIT ALL WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS ON-LINE TO bchalfin@ufl.edu.
5. Final Project – Research Proposal or Annotated Bibliography (25%) A final assignment consisting of an annotated bibliography of approximately 25 entries is required. Students can develop a theme raised in class or pursue another topic of general relevance to anthropological perspectives on the state. Students should decide on their topic and provide sample citations by March 22 and prepare a 1 page handout to share on the last class meeting, April 19. The Research Proposal Option should follow the format suggested by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research and be 3500 words. Due April 23 by 4p. SUBMIT ON-LINE TO bchalfin@ufl.edu.

Course Materials:
Required books:
A. Sharma and A. Gupta, The Anthropology of the State: a reader (Blackwell 2006)
W. Opello and S. Rosow, The Nation-State and Global Order (Rienner 2004)
B. Anderson, Imagined Communities (Verso 1991 or more recent)
E. Balibar, We, The People of Europe (Princeton 2004)
G. Feldman, The Migration Apparatus (Stanford 2012)
D. Price, Weaponizing Anthropology (Counterpunch 2011)

Optional texts:
A. Petryna, Life Exposed (Princeton 2002 or 2012)
L. Gill, School of the Americas (Duke 2004)
M. Foucault, Discipline and Punish. (Vintage 1991)
S. Sassen, Territory, Authority, Rights (Princeton 2006)
Other Information and Resources
UF Anthropology Department Policy: web.anthro.ufl.edu
UF LIBRARY: http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/instruct/neworient.html
UF Academic Honesty Code: http://www.dso.ufl.edu/judicial/academic.htm
UF Disability Services: http://www.ufl.edu/disability
UF Counseling Services: www.council.ufl.edu
UF Student Mental Health Services: www.shcc.ufl.edu/smhs

Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Class 1: Jan 4 Introduction
Working the State: The Perils and Promise of Anthropology
What is the state and why study it anthropologically?

Jan 11: NO CLASS MEETING: Dr. Chalfin at Open Society Oil Governance Conference Ghana

Class 2: Jan 18 The State: Historical Foundations and Theoretical Perspectives

Sabine, G. 1933, “State,” Encyclopedia of Social Science
Weber, M. 1968, Economy and Society, Bedminster, pp. 212-231
Anderson, P. 1979, Lineages of the Absolutist State, Verso, pp. 17-42
Background:

Discussion Q1: How do anthropological and sociological perspectives on state formation differ from historical renderings of the modern state? Do these approaches hold anything in common? Are they compatible?
Discussion Q2: What depictions of the ‘state’ (writ-large) and the ‘modern state’ do you find the most intriguing or problematic?

Class 3 Jan 25: The State, the Nation and the Colony
Anderson, B. 1991, Imagined Communities, Verso, selections
J. Kelly and M. Kaplan, 2001, Represented Communities: Fiji and World Decolonization, Ch.1 (or article in Anthropological Theory)
Sassen, S. Territory, Authority, Rights. pp. 1-18, 74-99

Background:

Skim:
Visweswaran, K. “Affective States,” Topoi, 1999, pp. 81-86

Discussion Q 1: Where is the state in discussions of the nation? Where is the colony in discussions of the state?
Discussion Q 2: What is K&K’s and G’s critique of Anderson? Are you convinced?

Class 4 Feb 1: States of Imagination: Culture, Ideology and Hegemony
(also note http://www.english.emory.edu/Bahri/hegemony.html)

Discussion Q 1: Comment on the relationship btw EFSF and the claims of Abrams.
Discussion Q 2: What is the relationship (and distinction) between hegemony, ideology and culture?
Discussion Q 3: How do today’s readings tie-in with, complicate or depart from previous course material?

Class 5 Feb 8 : Governmentality: The Logics and Tactics of Disciplinary Authority
Discussion Q 1: Compare how the essays in DII, Rose, Agrawal, Trouillot and Ferguson develop Foucault’s ideas on governmentality? Can you propose any other relevant applications?

Discussion Q 2: Do you consider these perspectives of Gramsci and Foucault compatible?

Class 6 Feb 15: Embodied, Gendered and Affective States
Linke, U. “Contact Zones: Rethinking the sensual life of the state, Anthropological Theory, June 2006, v. 6, Issue 2, pp. 205-225
L. Berlant, 2006, “Cruel Optimism” essay and Berlant Interview

Discussion Q1: What are of the theoretical and ethnographic challenges and promise of bringing affect and embodiment to the center of studies of state power?
Discussion Q2: What are of the theoretical and ethnographic challenges and promise of bringing gender and sexuality to the center of studies of state power?
Discussion Q 3: How do today’s readings tie-in with, complicate or depart from previous course material?

Class 7 Feb 22: Citizenship and Alienage: Legal, Incipient and Insurgent
Balibar, E. 2004, We, the People of Europe: Reflections on Transnational Citizenship, Princeton. Ch.3.

Discussion Q 1: How do the European cases compare regarding the role of state and non-state institutions in determining and enforcing the terms of contemporary citizenship?
Discussion Q 2: What do these case studies suggest about sites and strategies for the empirical study of citizenship and its transformation?
Discussion Q 3: How do today’s readings tie-in with, complicate or depart from previous course material?

Class 8 Mar 1: The Public Sphere, the State and the Social Contract
J. Habermas, Sections I 1&2, II 4,5,6 and V 16, 17, in The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. MIT. 1991. Pp. 1-50 & 141-159 (and sections on LIFEWORLD)
J. Ferguson, *Give a Man a fish: reflections on the new politics of distribution*. Ch.6 and Conclusion. Duke. 2015.


Discussion Q1. Discuss the range of ways the public sphere or public realm is conceptualized in these works? Do different theorizations point out different political possibilities and features of public life?

Discussion Q2. How firmly is the distinction between the public and private drawn? Do you consider this divide analytically productive? How might we move beyond it?

**UF SPRING BREAK – NO CLASS MARCH 8**

**Class 9 Mar 15: Security, Surveillance and Critical Infrastructure**


See https://culanth.org/curated_collections/14-security


Background:


Discussion Q1. Discuss the place of science and technology studies (STS) in anthropology’s engagement with and critique of contemporary security trends?

Discussion Q2. Assess the methods available to study bureaucratic and other forms of expertise?

Discussion Q3. Compare the different ways anthropologies of the state approach infrastructure.

**MARCH 22: Research Day**

FINAL PAPER TOPIC and PRELIMINARY CITES (1page) due 12p.

**Class 10 March 29: Nation-States and Violence**


MacLeish, K. Ch. 2 & 4 in Making War at Fort Hood: Life and Uncertainty in a Military Community. 2013.

Discussion Q 1: How does military training contribute to both the process of ‘everyday state formation’and the imperial project?
Discussion Q 2: What are the connections and distinctions between militarization and securitization?
Discussion Q 3: How do today’s readings tie-in with, complicate or depart from previous course material?

April 5: No class meeting. Dr. Chalfin at American Association of Geographers, Boston, MA.

Class 12 April 12: Anthropology in the Service of the State?
N. Whitehead Ch. 1 in Virtual War and Magical Death, ed N. Whitehead and S. Finnstroom, Duke. 2013, pp. 26-44.
AAA Ethics Codes: 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s. (Review 3 codes)

In-class activity: What are the central ethical debates raised by the conduct of anthropological research in the context of war? Has the discipline changes its view of the ethics of these activities over time? What recommendations would you make regarding future revisions of the AAA Ethics Code?

April 19: Final Reflections and Wrap-Up
Last class meeting. “Taking Stock” essay due (10%).

April 23: Annotated Bibliography Due